DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 254 SO 010 139

AUTHOR Grabiner, Gene
TITLE In Defense of Revisionism.
PUB DATE 7 Apr 77
NOTE 39p.; Portions of this paper were presented at Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, New York, April 3-8, 1977) under the title "The Limits of Educational Revisionism"; Not available in hard copy due to poor reproducibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Freedom; Analytical Criticism; Authors; Critical Reading; Educational History; Educational Researchers; *Historiography; *Literary Criticism; *Political Attitudes; Political Influences; *Research Methodology; Research Skills; Social Attitudes; Social Class; Social Science Research; Social Stratification; Socioeconomic Influences; Textual Criticism
IDENTIFIERS *Revisionism

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the misuse of historical data in attacks on educational revisionism and describes the contributions made by revisionists. Maintaining that the works of historical revisionists must be critically analyzed and their inadequacies recognized if they are to have lasting value, the author presents a textual criticism of a recent work which contains all of the complaints which conservative scholars generally level against works by revisionists. The book, by Columbia education professor Diane Ravitch, is entitled "The Revisionists Revised: Studies in the Historiography of American Education." The review describes Ravitch's technique as one which discovers presumed errors in the works of revisionist authors and attempts to discredit them on grounds of poor scholarship and/or incorrect interpretation. The author maintains that Ravitch clouds issues raised by revisionists by refusing to recognize contributions made by progressive writers on social and occupational mobility, IQ scores, capitalist imperatives, racism, access to higher education, and class analysis. The conclusion is that Ravitch's critique is obscurationist, constitutes a political attack on the revisionists is not in the spirit of academic freedom of inquiry, and is reactionary rhetoric rather than collegial criticism. (Author/DB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED141254

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Gene Grabiner
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

In Defense of Revisionism*

©Gene Grabiner**
Assistant Professor
Department of Social,
Philosophical and Historical
Foundations of Education
State University of New York
at Buffalo

Portions of this paper were presented at the Meetings of the

American Educational Research Association, New York City

April 7, 1977

under the title,

"The Limits of Educational Revisionism." Session 24.22

SP010139

---

*My thanks to Steve Aby, Virginia Louise Engquist-Grabiner, Gail Paradise Kelly and John Marciano for their suggestions and assistance in the preparation of this paper.

**Not to be quoted without permission of the author.

I. Introduction:

Forbidden Knowledge and the Just Distribution of Knowledge

In some stylish literary circles, the '50's were a suppressed, secret delight; always interesting to discover, like ms's lost in bottles long ago. And, while "Happy Days" and "Laverne and Shirely" are one-sided attempts to relive the '50's, there is another literature on the period. Morton Sobell's On Doing Time, Lillian Hellman's Scoundrel Time, its review in Political Affairs by Daniel Mason, the work of Gar Alperovitz,[1] "Tailgunner Joe", "Hollywood on Trial" and "The Front" are some representative examples.

Any time the bourgeoisie revives the '50's or the Palmer Raids, the Ludlow Massacre or the hangings of Henry VIII, it confronts us with Cotton Mather and General Custer. A witch-hunt begins and a new demonology is fashioned about progressive, radical and marxist scholarship. This ideological suppression, force and coercion is typical of reaction; and at one level it functions by presenting political attacks in the guise of scholarly criticism.

As an example of current ruling-class criticisms of progressive, radical and marxist scholarship, we can turn to the Rapporteurs of the Trilateral Commission's mose recent publication, The Crisis of Democracy. There, progressive scholars are seen as enemies of "democracy" and redefined as potential political criminals:

> At the present time, a significant challenge comes from the intellectuals and related groups who assert their disgust with the corruption, materialism, and inefficiency of democracy and with the subservience of democratic government to "monopoly capitalism". The development of an "adversary culture" among

> intellectuals has affected students, scholars, and the media...In an age of widespread secondary school and university education, the pervasiveness of the mass media, and the displacement of manual by clerical and professional employees, this development constitutes a challenge to democratic government which is, potentially at least, as serious as those posed in the past by the aristocratic cliques, fascist movements, and communist parties.[2]

The class struggle, which goes on in the political sphere, in political society, is aimed at production and culture; the whole of social life. In the academy, it has its reflex in ideological struggle. Here, the struggle is constantly one of science pitted against mystification. Despite a penchant for academic mystification among many intellectuals, scientific breakthroughs have been achieved and many educationists of the past decade have made important contributions to the advancement of social science. The parameters which bound educational revisionism, therefore, are of <u>two</u> sorts; fictional and scientific. In order to get to science it is often necessary to clear away the mists of fancy.

In this latter realm, we have the social scientism of Professor Diane Ravitch's recent critique of educational revisionism.[3] It is particularly important to deal with her work in some detail because, more than any other critique, Ravitch's contains within it virtually all of the conservative brickbats thrown at the revisionists. Since Ravitch is clearly trying to establish herself as the "official" judge of the educational revisionists,[4] I will attempt here to put to rest some of the grossest distortions found in her work. While, as we shall see later in this paper, I have my own criticisms to make of the revisionists, the main discussion will center on Ravitch's wholesale review of the revisionists.

The revisionists of the present period (whom Diane Ravitch has labelled "radical revisionists") are pioneer educationists; courageous and serious

enough about their social science to challenge the common wisdom of the dominant conceptions in the academy. These dominant conceptions are expressions of a bourgeois class outlook which characterizes the work of Diane Ravitch. Consequently, the reader must understand at the outset that my critique of Ravitch is not simply a critique of an individual scholar. Her work is an expression of continuing attempts to rewrite history in a manner more congenial with the persistence of state-monopoly capitalism in the United States and its desired maintenance of institutional and social domination. Ravitch must, appropriately then, be seen as a spokesperson for bourgeois interests, a member of the intelligentsia whose work expresses the material interests of the ruling class.

I am sure that Professor Ravitch quite believes the perspective given voice in her work on the revisionists. On this view, one could not (at least at this level of intellectual enterprise) charge conspiracy. Nevertheless, the relation between the intellectual representatives of a class and that class' material interests and activities in production are expressed in the work of the former group. Karl Marx provides us with the following specific illustration of this general relationship between classes and their spokespersons.

> [o]ne must not form the narrow-minded notion that the petty bourgeoisie, on principle, wishes to enforce an egoistic class interest. Rather, it believes that the special conditions of its emanciapation are the general conditions within the frame of which alone modern society can be saved and the class struggle avoided. Just as little must one imagine that the democratic representatives are indeed all shopkeepers or enthusiastic champions of shopkeepers. According to their education and their individual position they may be as far apart as heaven from earth. What makes them representatives of the petty bourgeoisie is the fact that in their minds they do not get beyond the limits which the latter do not go beyond in life, that they are consequently driven, theoretically, to the same problems and solutions to which material interest and social position drive the latter practically.[5]

While the specific case referred to had to do with the concrete conditions of France in 1848, Marx closes this passage with the comment that:

> This is, in general, the relationship between the political and literary representatives of a class and the class they represent.[6]

Hence, it is clear that Marx is providing us with an object lesson about the role of intellectuals, generally. This is echoed in Lenin's point that "the intelligentsia are so called just because they most consciously, most resolutely and most accurately reflect and express the development of class interests and political groupings as a whole".[7]

Because the class struggle continues in spite of the will of the ruling class, that class, being more or less conscious of itself, finds that it must sanitize knowledge and sanctify certain liberal scholars while attempting to fire, blacklist or discredit the scholarship of other more progressive academics. And, the bourgeoisie strives to legitimate such political activities by giving these attacks the appearance of scholarly and scientific criticism. Furthermore, not only do liberal scholars see radical work as unscientific; radical scholars are often characterized by such bourgeois intellectuals as "irrational" or "uncongenial" as well. That, however, is the mask worn by academic repression. The testaments offered by the cases of Scott Nearing, Thorsetin Veblen and, most recently Paul Nyden at the University of Pittsburgh, are signal examples of the repression of Left scholarship in the modern academy. Nor are these isolated exceptions. Today, there are numerous progressive, radical and marxist scholars who are unable to get work precisely because of the scientific perspective they bring to their task.

What is captured and criticized here in Diane Ravitch's work is presently emerging in all fields. Accordingly, there is a need for joint efforts on behalf

of progressive scholars to combat these attacks. Such struggles should be carried on in and through professional associations, associations dedicated to radical scholarship (e.g., the Union for Radical Political Economics [URPE]), in journals and through faculty unions (where they exist), as well as in connection with the struggles of working people, generally. It is critical, intellectually and politically, not to leave the field to reaction; particularly when there are now more progressive, radical and marxist scholars populating the academy than at any previous time in its history.

II. The Review

In an 84 page book review of nine authors, "The Revisionists Revised: Studies in the Historiography of American Education," published by the National Academy of Education under a $411,900.00 grant from the Ford Foundation,[8] Diane Ravitch of Teachers College, Columbia University purports to show us why all the authors reviewed suffer from poor scholarship and/or incorrect interpretation. Those reviewed are: Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, Walter Feinberg, Henry Rosemont, Jr., Colin Greer, Clarence J. Karier, Michael Katz, Joel Spring and Paul Violas.[9] These authors are said to "represent different manifestations of the radical thinking of their times".[10] Ravitch notes that they differ ideologically. However, these distinctions don't appear very profound, ranging from the anarchistic tradition out of which Joel Spring has written to the marxist perspective of Bowles and Gintis.

Discovering presumed errors in the work of Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis and then criticizing these "errors" is part of Ravitch's overall attempt to discredit the revisionists and marxism. Simultaneously, it is a refusal to recognize the contribution made in their progressive writings.

For example, they have done admirable, empirical work, demonstrating that there is no group upward social mobility and that such a route to equality is a false conception. Additionally, they have shown that school and social success have nothing to do with the presumed causal factors of biologistic notions of IQ. Supplementing this is their important work on correspondence, demonstrating the determinative character of industrial norms on schooling and emphasizing that education is dominated by capitalist imperatives.

As demonstrated by her general approach to the revisionist scholars, it appears that one task of Ravitch's review is to cloud the issues which they have raised. The type of arguments made in Ravitch's liberal critique aim at obscuring the range of radical and marxist scholarship presently being done. And, with the general bankruptcy of liberal social science becoming more apparent daily, only the progressive, radical and marxist outlook of the revisionists can extend the development of social science in education.

Ravitch asserts that the revisionists attribute conspiracy to the American ruling class for the failure of the schools to deliver on the promise of upward social mobility. She maintains that the revisionists, "despite their substantial differences...do share the understanding that American schools have been an intentional, purposeful failure and an integral part of the larger failure of American society."[11] While the failure at both levels is real, it is not, throughout its history, conspiratorial. However, this assertion allows Ravitch both to disclaim distinctions between the revisionists and to suggest to the reader that they engage in poor historiography (even though Ravitch has already noted that not all are historians). Certainly, as progressive, radical and marxist scholars, they can and should be joined. But, to confound them together as adherents of a conspiracy theory of history is something else. This false charge should give us a clue to the style of argument made by Ravitch.

Upon scrutiny we find that she is guilty of the very charges she has hurled at the revisionists. The review is formally correct in its overall organization. That is, it has quotes, footnotes, etc. However, at critical junctures there are only vague references with no supportive citations or objective warrants. Ravitch also favors selective portions of quotes or just plain "common wisdom". Her work is less scholarship than a political attack. Furthermore, as I will demonstrate in this article, there are serious theoretical deficiencies with the concepts employed by Ravitch.

III. Overthrowing the Canons of Scholarship

Professor Ravitch's review opens with her version of the history of recent revisionism in American historiography. Two strains of revisionism are said to have emerged in the early '60's. One trend is seen by Ravitch as typified by the work of Richard Hofstadter.[12] This tendency is implied to be a judicious, and critical where necessary, "re-evaluation of the progressive era, with all its troublesomeand illiberal strains".[13] The other trend, which Ravitch labels "radical revisionism" is distinguished from Hofstadter in that it sought not a "reassessment of liberalism but a repudiation of it."[14]

As between the two revisionist tendencies, Ravitch sets her sights on the "radicals". We are left with the impression that, apart from the "loyal opposition" of Richard Hofstadter,[15] the "radical revisionist" perspective sprang up in a vacuum, without scholarly antecedents. One might actually believe this, given the fact that the submerged histories of the labor movement, minority struggles, women's struggles and the struggle for democratic rights seem to have to be learned anew by each generation. And surely these histories have not been examined in any systematic and open fashion in our public schools.

Of course, the "radical revisionists" do have roots. To deny this would be ahistorical. They can be traced, in the recent period, to William Appleman Williams, Gabriel Kolko and James Weinstein.[16] Williams and Kolko have already had some experience with "establishment" criticism. It appears that whenever "radical revisionism", marxist historiography and New Left historiography pose a significant challenge to the standard fare, the canons of scholarship are overthrown in attempts to discredit these trends. For example, Francis Lowenheim, in a review of Robert James Maddox's book, The New Left and the Origins of the Cold War,[17] called for the censorship of the "Cold War revisionists", Kolko and Williams, for making an interpretation of atomic diplomacy that laid the blame in Washington. Clearly, for Lowenheim and, as we shall see, for the more sophisticated Ravitch, the just distribution of knowledge along class lines is the measure of scholarship—science and the "free marketplace of ideas" notwithstanding.

Within the last few months, copies of Ravitch's review have been sent to Clarence Karier's publisher, Michael Katz's publisher and the deans of many schools of education around the country (including Joel Spring's dean at the University of Cincinnati). Mailings of this sort, in the context of the present controversy may certainly constitute unwarranted and political attacks on progressive scholars.[18] Such attacks as those made by Ravitch use scholarship as a smokescreen for political reaction.

Desirous of celebrating the Kennedy-Johnson period and its "liberal agenda for social reform",[19] Ravitch informs us that during that era, "vast sums were appropriated for new programs".[20] Were she discussing militarism, she would be correct. However, her review makes it clear that this is not her intent. We are led to believe that these large appropriations were for social service-type programs (e.g., education).

Upon examination of the data, however, "vast sums" is an insufficient referent for any discussion of these expenditures. For example, in 1965, $48.6 billion was spent for national defense. In that same year, only $2.1 billion was spent for education, manpower and social services combined. In 1968, another year of the "liberal agenda", $79.4 billion was spent for national defense and $7.0 billion was spent for education, manpower and social services.[21] For the years 1966-1968, we find the total appropriations of Title I, ESEA funds (part A), when expressed as a percent of total authorization, to exhibit a constant decline. Hence, the appropriations for '66, '67 and '68 were 80, 74, and 63 percent of their respective authorizations.[22] The Headstart and Follow-Through programs exhibited parallel fiscal inadequacies.[23]

From the preceding, it is clear that when it comes to "vast sums", education in the United States cannot hold a candle to imperialist war in Indochina and the militarization of the economy. The projected 1977-1978 military budget, for example, is in excess of $115 billion. Even controlling for inflation, this budget represents gross overexpenditure. Furthermore, it is a "peacetime" budget.

A central theme of Ravitch's review is a hymn to upward social mobility.[24] And, she notes that "[t]he important question is not whether there was racism and exploitation in the past, for clearly there was; the question, rather, is whether American society is getting better or worse or remaining the same for those who have been victimized in the past".[25] As an illustrative case, disadvantage for "white ethnic minorities" is discussed. Ravitch selectively quotes Peter Blau and Otis Dudley Duncan,[26] who claim that such groups have opportunities which vary little from "whites of native parentage" and, indeed, "are considerably superior to those of southern whites."[27]

I am aware that her aim in this section was not to discuss Blacks (which she does later). However, in speaking of Kennedy-Johnson liberal reform and upward social mobility, one should not spearate "white ethnic minorities" and minorities of color who, if we speak of Blacks, are also of native parentage. The complete quote from Blau and Duncan sheds some more light on the problem of disadvantage. "In sharp contrast to the inferior opportunities of Negroes, therefore, the occupational opportunities of white ethnic minorities, on the whole, differ little from those of whites of native parentage. (Indeed, they are considerably superior to those of southern whites)".[28] Of course, if "white ethnic minorities" differ little from whites of native parentage on the whole, then there is no point in referring to them as "minorities"; this would only obscure the profound disadvantage suffered by minorities of color and all poor people in this country (including southern whites). Actually, when we consider "white ethnic minorities" who are, structurally, predominately working class, it is clear that their "life chances" are narrowed to the usual proletarian "options". These "occupational opportunities" still only allow limited movement, if any, within a stratified work force. The oppression experienced by workers who happen to be white is compounded in the lives of workers who happen to be minorities of color. And, of employed minorities of color, all groups are predominantly working class. For example, of employed Blacks, 96.8 percent are working class in contrast to 86.3 percent for the employed white population.[29] Additionally, the Black population experiences a greater percent of people impoverished by capitalism than by whites. Systemic unemployment and racism are a double weight on the backs of the Black people. Nevertheless, both white and Black working people are oppressed by capitalism. Furthermore, the special oppression of racism makes it easier for the capitalists to attack the wages and conditions of white workers as well.[30]

Much as Ravitch suggests that it isn't so, schools really do significantly participate in the reproduction of a stratified proletariat. Wealth and ownership of the means of production are the underlying and ultimate factors in terms of "life chances", educational privilege and "mobility". For example, "80 percent of 1965 high school seniors who graduated did not attend college in 1967 if their family income was under $3,000 as compared to only 13 percent of those with family incomes of $15,000 and over".[31]

The central point about occupational mobility is not how well or poorly the system operates, but why it exists in the first place. Why is the working class stretched out as so many rungs of scalar inequality on a "stepladder society".[32] These are the questions we should ask about the system of occupational mobility so favored by Professor Ravitch. And, if we ask such questions which force us to be radical, that is to get at the roots of social structure in an unequal and exploitative class society, we will have to draw other conclusions about the stepladder of social mobility. We will have to see that:

> It is a subterfuge, and a very effective one at that, to divert concern away from the construction of a secure, satisfying, and humane economic and social order...The focus would be out where it belongs: between the ruling class and the working class, between the vested interests and the underlying population. It would pull the working class toward thinking in terms of change <u>of</u> the system rather than the killing and hopeless struggle of reaching the top rungs <u>within</u> the existing system.[33]

Now, just because the schools participate in the reproduction of the capitalist division of labor, as they unavoidably do in a society dominated by capital, is not an immediate or automatic basis to argue for de-schooling or the abolition of compensatory education. Rather, we should argue that the schools be used for human fulfillment—to train <u>every</u> young person to such a degree of literacy, numeracy and related cognitive skills that they

might go to college should they so choose. Furthermore, this would require an "open and free system of higher education right through graduate and professional schools"[34] for all young people and their parents should they so choose. This means an end to education dominated by capitalist requirements for the production of the differentiated commodity—labor-power. Accordingly, we should call for increased expenditures on human needs and a reconversion from the military budget to a real peace budget. In this time of discussion of human rights, we must secure our human rights to education, health care, housing and jobs!

Coupled with the already-discussed occupational mobility, we have Ravitch's variant of "blaming the victim". Ultimately, Ravitch's view stems from her concurrence with Blau and Duncan who, in a neoclassical fashion, argue that Blacks haven't gone to postsecondary education in great numbers because they've received less rewards for their investments than the majority population. Hence, there has been little incentive for them to invest in higher education. This state of affairs is supposed to help "explain why many Negroes exhibit little interest or motivation in pursuing their education".[35]

This presumes two things; first of all that racism is on the decline in America (for which, in the face of specific historical gains, we have no certain evidence), and, secondly, that Blacks are socially and economically autonomous and "free-market individuals". Actually, it's possible that the fact that a few Blacks have "made it" has been used to solidify racism. Just because there are some Blacks here and there who've succeeded, that shouldn't be used to blame the masses of the Black people who have not been allowed access to avenues of upward social mobility by virtue of systemic racism, inequality and working class oppression.

So, for Blau and Duncan as for Ravitch, ignoring the persistence of racism results in recasting the problem as one that is endemic to Black folk. And, as Ravitch states, "[f]rom this perspective, dropping out of school was economically rational behavior for Blacks".[36] Here, the victims are doubly blamed, First, they are said to have "dropped out", rather than to have been pushed out by virtue of the systematic classist and racist exclusion of Blacks from schooling (particularly from higher education). Secondly, such a market model of economic rationality absolves the ruling class in this society from having power over the structural features which result in these push-outs. This strategy fictionally recreates the Black population as fiscally autonomous and capable of making choices for "educational investment" apart from racism and poverty.

Later on in her review, Ravitch tells us that America is still the land of opprotunity for individual market choices. For example, we are informed that "those blacks who are under 35, well educated, and middle class" have achieved "full economic equality with their white peers".[37] As noted above, this refers only to a tiny portion of the Black population. Ravitch then jumps to the conclusion that this tiny minority stands for the whole Black group. "For the first time, black investment in education is worth making. Just as dropping our was once an economically rational decision, getting more education is now as rational for blacks as it has been for whites".[38] It is hard to misunderstand that Ravitch "blames the victim" as a supposed social science explainer. For her, milk and honey are flowing for the autonomous population of Black educational investors; particularly if they have the cash to invest.

And that is the fatal flaw. As of 1970, the per capita income of the dominant, "white anglo" group in the United States was $3,383. For the Black population it was $1,818.[39] Furthermore, according to data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), 55 percent of all Black American families were

below the 1971 "lower budget" designation of $7,214 for a family of four. Whites didn't do so well either, with the percent of whites below that level being 28 percent. Likewise, for the BLS "intermediate budget" of $10,971, 77 percent of all Black families and 52 percent of all white families fell below this designation which was considered to represent income adequacy for a family of four in 1971.[40]

Having some sense of the general picture in mind, we can turn to Ravitch's statement that Blacks are "making it" in post-secondary education. For the small group who are highly successful, there is no doubt of parity with equally successful whites. But what of her simple assertion that more Blacks are going to college than ever before? She states that:

> From 1964 to 1975, the proportion of blacks increased from 5% to 10% of all college students. In the fall of 1974, 12.3% of all college freshmen were Black (blacks were then 11.4% of the total population and 12% of all college-age persons). The black-white enrollment gap has steadily narrowed during the past decade. In 1964, 10.3% of all blacks between 18 and 24 were in college, compared to 25.5% of whites. By 1975, 20.7% of blacks in this age group were in college compared to 26.9% of whites. Black college enrollment reached 948,000 in 1975, a 246% increase in a decade (the white increase was 60%). Additionally, an identical 17% of both white and black families below the poverty line reported at least one family member in college.[41]

On the face of it, this statistical picture tells us that every day, if not in every way, but at least in Black college attendance, things are getting better and better. Are they? Apart from the termination of the open enrollment program of the City University of New York and the spontaneous re-introduction of "standards"[42] at colleges and universities about the country, there are other moves afoot to turn back the gains of the '60's.

In the preceding quote, Ravitch tells us that Blacks were 11.4% of the population in 1974. However, as Victor Perlo points out:

> There is always a serious undercounting of the Black population. Census statisticians estimated that 1.9 million Blacks were not counted in the 1970 Census, up from 1.6 million in 1960, but there is evidence that they were too cautious, and that the undercounting may have been 3 million or more. Thus, as of mid-decade, 1975, there are about 28 million Black people, or one-eighth of the total population of the country.[43]

Based on census undercounting, we can see that the 12.3% freshmen enrollment figure cited for Blacks by Ravitch does not represent population parity. Nor do her data, partially culled from a New York Times article entitled "Black College Enrollment Held Equal to Population Proportion",[44] capture an accurate picture of the real state of Black participation in higher education. Like Ravitch's work, the Times article's headline focuses only upon the surface appearance of statistical evidence. And, consistent with her mobilization of bias, it is only this level of reality she chooses to present to us. Taking such appearances at face value, the reader might easily concur with Ravitch's assertions. However, in reading beyond the headline, even the first paragraph clarifies things a good deal.

> Blacks are apparently entering college in numbers roughly equivalent to their representation in the total population, but their dropout rate is significantly higher than that of whites, a Census Bureau study reported today.[45]

Even though the Times article errs in reporting the undercounted Census percentage of the Black population as representing their actual numbers in the United States, it at least points out that Blacks are not "making it", since their "dropout" (i.e., pushout) rate is higher than that for whites.

It is clear that data abound which don't support Ravitch's rosy view. Her statistics are only an artifact-producing set of surface numbers. In probing "behind" the statistics she offers we will be able to generate a more accurate picture of the differentiated character of college attendance for Blacks. The problem with such bald, numerical renderings of social life as

that given by Diane Ravitch is that, in the vein of Durkheim's positivistic concept of official rates being direct representations of "social facts",[46] they obscure structural differences which are of major significance. This numerical naivete is an expression of shallow scholarship and little theoretical depth. Therefore, while enrollment figures are not unimportant, I think that we must also look at; the character of the colleges attended by Blacks, enrollment versus graduation, the presence of and completion by Blacks in graduate programs and the entire question of employment.

While enrollment figures may have been on the increase, this appears to be a short-lived datum, given the cutbacks in open enrollment, Black studies and other minority programs, economic opportunity grants and programs etc. Furthermore, the greatest concentration of Black undergraduates is to be found in the first two years of undergraduate school. In fact, a disproportionate number of Blacks and other minorities, as well as poor whites who do go to college are to be found in junior college programs offering terminal A.A. degrees.[47]

According to some recent data on undergraduate entry, of Black students enrolled as undergraduates in Fall, 1973, 23 percent were enrolled in Black colleges, North and South.[48] As of October, 1973, Blacks accounted for 9.2 percent of all students enrolled in public two-year colleges, 13 percent of those enrolled in public four-year colleges and only 6 percent of those enrolled in public universities. Similarly, undergraduate enrollments among Spanish surname and American Indian populations were disproportionately concentrated in the public two-year colleges and in the lower division of the higher education process. For example, in 1970, 83.4 percent of all Blacks enrolled in New York State were in lower division designations. Only 16.6 percent were in the upper division. As for earned degrees, in 1969-70 the contradictions were even grosser.

> [M]ost Black graduates received their degrees from four-year colleges (73.3%), while Whites received a much smaller proportion from four-year colleges; second, the percentages of Blacks (5.2%) earning degrees is much less than the percentage enrolled (6.9%); and third, the small percentage of Blacks graduating from elite universities (26.7%) when compared to Whites (46.4% would tend to suggest that Blacks may have a less chance of getting into graduate and professional schools.[50]

In a new study, "The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1976", published by the American Council on Education and directed by Alexander W. Astin of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program of the Graduate School of Education at the University of California at Los Angeles, it was determined that 8.4 percent of the sample of 215,890, 1976-77 freshmen surveyed were Black.[51] Assuming, as I think we can, that we take Professor Ravitch's 12.3 percent figure as an accurate recording of the size of Black freshmen enrollments in 1975 (although, as I've shown, population parity has never been achieved due to both educational and social inequality and Census undercounting), Professor Astin's findings, if significantly indicative of a trend, suggest that the attack on the gains of the '60's (e.g., ending open enrollment programs etc.) is turning back the participation of minority and working class populations in higher education.

The picture of Black participation graduate school is even worse. Blacks accounted for 3.4 percent of all graduate school enrollments in 1970.[52] And, although there is a much greater possibility of completion once an individual is enrolled in graduate school, it is clear that Blacks, in 1970, were not graduate students in proportion to their numbers in the general population. Even with the greater likelihood of completion, the pressures on all minority graduate students are tremendous. These pressures come from a complex of factors rooted in the capitalist and racist political economy of the United States. Consequently, we find that, from B.A. to Ph.D., the <u>median</u> completion

time for Blacks as of Fiscal Year 1975 (excluding dentistry, law and medicine) was 12.4 years. For whites the figure was only 8.5 years. Likewise, the average age at completion for Blacks was 36.3 years while for whites it was 31.4 years.[53]

Even though the data I have presented apply only to the period 1969-1970 and to 1973 and 1975, they are exemplary of the type of data necessary to give the reader an accurate and scholarly picture of the educational gains or losses experienced by a population. Surely, (in the interests of judiciousness and scholarship) these kinds of data should have been used by Diane Ravitch.

More important than surface changes in undergraduate entry figures are the recent moves to close open enrollment programs referred to above. Likewise, in viewing the custodial function of schooling with relation to the industrial reserve army, some increases in enrollments for minority andpoverty-line families may simply be alternatives to non-existent jobs[54] instead of education with an eye toward future employment.

We must also see Diane Ravitch as one of a group of cynical, anti-communist and obscurantist "convergence theorists" who argue that bureaucracy is a presumed natural property of "advanced industrial societies", thus joining the United States and the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in a Kafka-land of endless bureaus. If one follows the logic of this argument, one naturally concludes that either, a) socialism has nothing better to offer human beings than capitalism therefore, why try to achieve it, or, b) the Soviet Union isn't socialist, therefore where can one look for a model?—we may as well stick with out "liberal democratic society". However, this argument is based on the unsupported but presumed "fact that bureaucracy is a characteristic organizational form in socialist and Communist

nations."[55] With no references or data to back it up, this "fact" is supposed to convince us that bureaucracy "is not a 'bourgeois invention' but a complex response to population growth, urbanization and modernization".[56]

Surely, a distinction must be made between the anti-democratic character of bureaucracy and centralization of a democratic sort, that is, democratic centralism. Cuba serves as a fine example. Today a socialist country, Cuba had inherited a 50 percent illiteracy rate from its previous existence under capitalism.[57] From January to December, 1961, through a massive mobilization of all available literate persons in that island nation, Cuba succeeded in lowering its illiteracy rate to 3.9 percent.[58]

The Cuban success was achieved without expanding the number of credentialled "reading specialists" and without a broad-scale system of "special examinations and the trained expertness that is increasingly indispensible for modern bureaucracy".[59] It would seem possible, then, to engage in certain large-scale social tasks on a democraticized and non-bureaucratic bais.

In Diane Ravitch's book review, "The Revisionists Revised...", we have a collection of unscholarly criticisms of the most recent, significant and progressive work in education. Her review, however, only serves the most backward sectors of the intellectual and political community. Objectively or not, Ravitch's work aids reaction in its attack on progressive, radical and marxist scholarship. Her false and facile disavowal of class analysis should emphasize this. She tells us that in "a society that lacks a widespread sense of class consciousness and class antagonism, class analysis is of limited value".[60] However, her review is an expression of class antagonism. Furthermore, among working people, class consciousness is coming into being in this society. And this consciousness has had a history of ebbs and flows

in the United States. Class antagonism continues independent of the subjective wills of the actors, their classes and "scholarly" reviewers.

Remaining only at the simplistic level of language analysis (or underdeveloped scholarship if she doesn't understand what socialism is—in which case she should read Marx and Lenin before passing judgements), Ravitch suggests that Bowles and Gintis have done wrong in discussing "socialism" and "democracy" since their "referents are never socialist democracies like Sweden or Israel [which has the highest rate of inflation in the world]. Instead they hail the revolutionary 'socialism' of such nations as the Soviet Union, North Vietnam, Cuba, and China".[61]

But, why shouldn't those countries be praised? After all, they are socialist! And they have made great strides! In reality, it is the interests that Ravitch serves as a "hired Head"[62] who would stand to lose from real socialism. Is that why she suggests that our attention be turned to ersatz socialism?

To further highlight the nature of Ravitch's work, we can turn to her criticisms of Joel Spring. They rest on pillorying his Primer of Libertarian Education,[63] a book which is not a historical work. His Education and the Rise of the Corporate State[64] is insipidly panned on the basis of its opening sentence. Ravitch then gives a kudo to Spring for The Sorting Machine: National Policy Since 1945.[65] However, this is only praise in passing and the reader never really learns what Ravitch values in that book. This is more of an attempt to "cover her tracks" than anything else.

In summation, we have, in Diane Ravitch's brand of liberalism, an intellectual hideout for reaction. Certainly, the insult to scholarship coupled with political attack that typifies her review and the special and selective form of dissemination it has enjoyed go together to construe for us a picture of attempted blacklisting of progressive, radical and marxist intellectuals and the censorship of their work.

IV. Some Materialistic Criticisms of Revisionism

I am in agreement with the statement made by Bill Russell at the recent American Educational Research Association Meetings that "we should be supportive of the work of the historical revisionists. Their analyses have opened up certain areas for discussion which had previously been either untouched or obscured by traditional educational historians. Of particular importance is their whole analysis of schooling as a means of social control."[66]

Having cut my graduate school teeth on the work of Joel Spring and Michael Katz, it was important to find that my understanding of what was happening to my junior high school charges (I had been a public school teacher in an inner-city junior high school in San Francisco before going to graduate school) was true. The schools were not avenues of group "upward social mobility". Most youngsters that I observed weren't learning for the sake of human fulfillment. They were being graded, disciplined and indoctrinated to serve the needs of capital. Capitalist social control was paramount, human needs were incidental.

Unavoidably, the revisionist attack on social control is an advanced development, since it is impossible to discuss what's wrong with social control unless one specifies the content of the problem. For example, at one level, Joel Spring's writing is critical of social control per se. However, a serious reading of his work makes it impossible to ignore the fact that what is substantively under fire is <u>capitalist social control</u>. In fact, this is even made explicit in many passages. The point is that, independent of the subjective will of an author in arguing against social control per se is the requirement to marshal data in order to discuss the problem at all. Social control, at this level of analysis, can only be concretely discussed as being rooted in a real society having real class relations and in a particular historical period. So soon as

this is done with evidence, capitalist social control necessarily comes under fire—as it does in the work of the revisionists. Social control in the abstract is no social control in particular. This is recognized somewhat by the revisionists, though, to a certain degree, it is abstracted social control which draws their fire. Recent revisionist developments indicate that, more and more, it is the specific class character of capitalism that is coming under scrutiny.

While breaking ground on the question of social and educational control, the revisionists have presented a somewhat "top-down" view of educational developments in the United States. They locate the germ of school expansion in the 19th and 20th centuries in the class-rule of capital. But, in many instances, they neglect the role of the working class, minorities and women in fighting back against bourgeois imperatives in the schools. Yet, what they have already done is a real breakthrough, since traditional historians of education have only seen a supposed general upward movement through the schools. These traditionalists have generally attributed successful occupational mobility to some nebulous "society" which supposedly provides mechanisms for achieving equality. The revisionist perspective should certainly put to rest this functionalism in earlier educational history.

The revisionists are not to be criticized for lack of due attention to the labor-education thesis in their early work. Such a missing discussion only reflects the level of theoretical development of the perspective at the time. We can expect that their progressive approach will soon incorporate a working class outlook. Meanwhile, revisionism has already been a breath of fresh air and careful scholarship.

Given some of the early one-sidedness, anarchistic and social democratic tendencies in educational revisionism, we are nevertheless confronted with a

body of progressive work that is generally characterized by a high degree of scholarship and good social science. Many of the problems, such as mechanical materialism and a neglect of the roles of class struggle and the role of minorities and women, are being overcome through a more rigorous application of a dialectical and historical perspective. Such theoretical deepening promises to spur further advances in the already significant work of the revisionists.

V. Conclusion

As I have noted in the introduction to this essay, there is a distinction between social science and mystification. The revisionists represent scientific developments in the field of educational research of a historical, philosophical, sociological, and economic sort. The work of Diane Ravitch is obscurantist and constitutes a political attack on the revisionists.

Herein lies the difference between Ravitch and the revisionists. The revisionists, even with the conceptual flaws they have sometimes exhibited, are contributing to the development of the field. Granted, their work is still in process, but it is progressing and it is intellectually stimulating and honest. On the other hand, much of the critique of their work seems, by and large, to stem from a conservative outlook which adds little either in terms of the generation of new data or new theoretical conceptions. Collegial criticism is one thing, but political attack is quite another. And the essential questions, in the academy as elsewhere, are questions of power and class struggle. As the Schwendingers have said in their book, The Sociologists of the Chair, "academic freedom is a sometime thing".[67]

Let's try to remember and act upon our initial commitment to academic freedom and scholarship. The revisionists should be encouraged in their search. Sometimes, it is difficult to be the voice which says that the emperor has no clothes, but we must not hide from saying that, nor should those who do be silenced.

Footnotes

1. Sobell, Morton. On Doing Time (New York: Bantam, 1976), Hellman, Lillian. Scoundrel Time (Boston: Little Brown, 1976), Mason, Daniel. "On 'Scoundrels' and 'Toads'", Political Affairs (December, 1976), Alperovitz, Gar. Atomic Diplomacy: Hiroshima and Potsdam (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1965).

2. Crozier, Michel J., Samuel P. Huntington and Joji Watanuki. The Crisis of Democracy: Report on the Governability of Democracies to the Trilateral Commission (New York: New York University Press, 1975), pp. 6-7.

3. Ravitch, Diane. "The Revisionists Revised: Studies in the Historiography of American Education" (No place of publication: The National Academy of Education, 1977).

4. Interestingly, among the listings of recent Guggenheim Fellows as reported in The Chronicle of Higher Education (April 11, 1977, p. 11), we find the following notation:
"Diane S. Ravitch, Adjunct Assistant Professor of History and Education. Teachers College of Columbia University.: A History of American Higher Education, 1946-1976". This, of course, is the same period covered in Joel Spring's excellent book, The Sorting Machine: National Educational Policy Since 1945. Can we anticipate, in Ravitch's work, an "official" version of the period already so superbly covered by Spring?

5. Marx, Karl. The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon (New York: International, 1969), pp. 50-51.

6. Ibid.

7. Lenin, V. I. Collected Works, Vol. 7 (Moscow: Progress, 1973), p. 45.

8. In 1972, the Ford Foundation approved a grant of $57,500.00 to the National Academy of Education for the "[e]stablishment of committees of educators and economists and anthropologists" (Ford Foundation. Report, October 1, 1971-September 30, 1972, New York, p. 36). In February, 1974, the Academy was granted $56,000.00 from Ford for a study of "training for educational administration in the U.S." (New York. Foundation News, July-August, 1974. Vol. 15, No. 4, p. G-212). Finally, the Ford Foundation awarded the National Academy of Education $411,900.00 for a 4-year period for "meetings and publications to infuse a research and scholarship component into public discussion of educational issues" (New York. Foundation News, November-December, 1974. Vol. 15, No. 6, p. G-331).

9. The books reviewed are; Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life, by Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis (New York: Basic, 1976), Reason and Rhetoric: The Intellectual Foundations of Twentieth Century Liberal Educational Policy, by Walter Feinberg (New York: Wiley, 1975), Work, Technology and Education: Dissenting Essays in the Intellectual Foundations of American Education, edited by Walter Feinberg and Henry Rosemont, Jr. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1975), The Great School Legend: A Revisionist Interpretation of American Public Education, by Colin Greer (New York: Basic, 1972), Roots of Crisis: American Education in the Twentieth Century, by Clarence J. Karier, Paul Violas and Joel Spring (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973), Shaping the American Educational State: 1900 to the Present, edited by Clarence J. Karier (New York: Free Press, 1975), Class, Bureaucracy and Schools, by Michael Katz (New York: Praeger, 1971), The Irony of Early School Reform: Educational Innovation in Mid-nineteenth Century Massachusetts, by Michael Katz (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968), Education and the Rise of the Corporate State, by Joel Spring (Boston: Beacon Press, 1972), A Primer of Libertarian Education, by Joel Spring (New York: Free Life Editions, 1975).

10. Ravitch, op cit., p. 7.

11. Ibid., pp. 7-8.

12. Hofstadter, Richard. The Age of Reform (New York: Vintage, 1955).

13. Ravitch, op. cit., p. 2.

14. Ibid.

15. Hofstadter's book, which won the Pulitzer Prize for history in 1956, is exemplary for its off-the-cuff defense of pragmatism and its denial of the "amoral" character of "Populist-progressive thinking...from 1890 to 1917" (p. 16). Hofstadter, in the vein of official history, doesn't fail to criticize some liberals who condemn fascism for their granting of "special indulgences to the barbarities and tyrannies of Soviet politics" (ibid.). In this regard, Hofstadter's anti-communist and anti-soviet neologism for such liberals is "totalitarian liberals" (p. 15). This type of revisionism is more in line with Ravitch's scholarly palate than the objects of her demonology, the "radical revisionists". Incidentally, Richard Hofstadter, along with such luminaries as Sir Cyril Burt, was a member of the National Academy of Education in 1969. For a listing of directors and fellows of the Academy in 1969 see; National Academy of Education. Committee on Educational Policy. Policy Making for American Public Schools; Recommendations Based Upon Working Papers (Syracuse; National Academy of Education, 1969).

16. Williams, William Appleman. The Contours of American History (Chicago: Quadrangle, 1969), Kolko, Gabriel. The Triumph of Conservatism: A Reinterpretation of American History, 1900-1916 (New York: Quadrangle, 1967), Weinstein, James. The

Corporate Ideal in the Liberal State: 1900-1918 (Boston: Beacon, 1968).

17. The Lowenheim review appeared in the New York Times Book Review of June 17, 1973. The full citation to the Maddox book is, Maddox, Robert James. The New Left and the Origins of the Cold War (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973).
In a series of letters to the editor of the New York Times (June 29, 1973), the victims of Lowenheim's red-baiting and other concerned individuals spoke loudly in defense of democratic rights and in opposition to this attempt at literary and political suppression. Although all the letters were to the point, the following quote from one captures both the viciousness of Lowenheim's attack as well as the democratic requirement to defend the "New-left-revisionist" historiography:

"Francis Lowenehim's praise of the Maddox book is additional evidence that an unhealthy movement is beginning against New-left-revisionist historiography. Unless the trend is checked, it promises to make the 1970's a repeat performance of the 1950's".

It seems clear that Ravitch has engaged in a similar, though more sophisticated, attack. Necessarily, the same objections must be raised about her piece as the above writer raises with reference to Lowenheim's.

18. While it is a common practice for reviewers to post their assessments to publishers of the books reviewed (and an even more common practice is for the publisher to solicit copies of reviews), this particular mailing is a new departure. While making an initial disclaimer that the "opinions expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the position of either the National Academy of Education or the Ford Foundation", the review was printed and posted on Ford's frank (see footnote 8, above) and was published by the National Academy of Education. As will be seen later in this article, the review gives strong emphasis to the view that Blacks have or are "making it" in the United States. Ravitch's data on Black undergraduate enrollment are supposed to accomplish this task. However, these data are inadequate and present a false picture. This is pointed out in my article.

Interestingly, Frank Brown and Madelon Stent (see footnote 49, below), having been funded by a Ford grant, arrived at conclusions diametrically opposed to Ravitch's. Furthermore, their argument is wrought with a degree of scholarship and theoretical development lacking in Ravitch's work. The Ford Foundation, however, did not fund their study's dissemination in a manner equivalent to that enjoyed by Ravitch. This seems to raise a legal question around the issue of equivalence of exposure to diverse views as set forth in the Internal Revenue Code and the Code Regulations. The relevant code passage refers to the responsibilities of tax-exempt foundations in hewing to democratic standards of information dissemination, regardless of the fact that divergent conclusions have been funded by the same foundation.

Does the one-sided coverage given by the Ford Foundation (through the National Academy of Education as embodied in Ravitch's review) to the presumed success of Black Americans in higher education constitute a possible violation of this section? We think that this may be the case. Section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code provides that "[a]n organization may be educational even though it advocates a particular position or viewpoint so long as it presents a sufficiently full and fair exposition of the pertinent facts as to permit an individual or the public to form an independent opinion or conclusion..." (26 U.S.C. § 501 (c) (3) (1970)).

19. Ravitch, op. cit., p. 5.

20. Ibid., p. 6.

21. United States Bureau of the Census. Statistical Abstract of the United States (96th edition) (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1975), p. 226, document #372, "Federal Budget Receipts, by Source, and Outlays, by Function: 1960-1975". For further contrasts between the "liberal agenda for social reform" and military expenditures, the following table is a good illustration.

Federal Budget Outlays by Function (in billions of dollars), 1960-1975

	1960	1965	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975(est.)
National Defense	45.2	48.6	80.2	79.3	76.8	77.4	75.1	78.6	85.3
Education, Manpower and Social Services	1.0	2.1	6.9	7.9	9.0	11.7	11.9	11.6	14.7

SOURCE: United States Bureau of the Census, Ibid.

22. National School Public Relations Association. Compensatory Education: What Works to Help Disadvantaged Pupils (Arlington, Virginia: National School Public Relations Association, 1973), p. 9 (from U. S. Office of Education Data).

23. U. S. Bureau of the Census. op. cit., and National School Public Relations Association, op. cit.

24. The main feature of Ravitch's argument is an attempt to demonstrate that Horatio Alger is not dead. She goes to such lengths to demonstrate this that she even lumps the revisionists together with Richard Herrnestein, an individual whose "science" is such social effrontery as, perhaps, even to upset Ravitch. In her passion to discredit the revisionists by a forced and false association with Herrnstein, she deletes the central portion of his racist argument (i.e., the presumed genetic bases of intelligence and poverty). But, as we've seen, distortions and straw men are Ravitch's stock in trade.

Another example of this style of argument is her reference to the economics of Arthur Okun, Simon Kuznets and Morton Paglin. The first two are cited as demonstrating that income inequality was reduced during World War II. On that view, of course, we may as well have war in order to achieve income equality (which really did not occur during World War II in any event). If the argument for belligerence as an equalizer is not sufficient, Ravitch gives us Paglin who notes that we really must include transfer payments in-kind (e.g., welfare payments) as part of recorded income. In which case he concludes that there has been a real reduction in income inequality since World War II. We should be quick to see that both Ravitch and Paglin neglect the causal fact of poverty which "enables" families to receive the welfare payments that Ravitch (and Paglin) celebrates as a step forward in income equalization. This impoverishment is a structural feature of capitalist society. And no amount of legerdemain in definitions of income equalization will make it go away.

As the above redefinition of income equalization indicates, Ravitch argues on shifting grounds in many portions of her review. Another example is highlighted in the following quote. "It is questionable whether a thoroughly radicalized, thoroughly Marxist Dewey and Counts would have had much impact at all on a society that was unreceptive to radical thought. They were men who lived in their times, not in ours, and it is unfair and ahistorical to expect them to have known what now seems apparent (p. 54)". It is Ravitch, however, who is being ahistorical. To presume that "their times" were unreceptive to or unfamiliar with marxism is patently false and outside of history. We need only look at Eugene Debs, the Socialist Party, the International Workers of the World, the North American Syndicalist League and, finally, the Communist Party of the United States of America to appreciate the marxist presence. Furthermore, as I've indicated elsewhere in this paper, there were radical and marxist academics who offered views distinct from those of Dewey and Counts. One such intellectual, Scott Nearing, was fired from his teaching position at the University of Toledo for his opposition to United States entry into World War I. Furthermore, he and the Socialist Party were tried for this pacifist stance in a federal court. John Dewey, on the other hand, was a warhawk. In this regard I recommend Clarence J. Karier's excellent article, "Making the World Safe for Democracy: An Historical Critique of John Dewey's Pragmatic Liberal Philosophy in the Warfare State", Educational Theory, vol. 27, no. 1 (Winter, 1977).

If we take Ravitch's conclusion that Dewey and Counts could not be faulted in "their times" for being non-marxists in view of what "now seems apparent", we can only conlcude that marxism finds in today's United States a society that is receptive to "radical thought". This being the case, why does Ravitch take such pains to attack marxism in her review? We can only decide what her criticism has nothing to do with scholarship and is inconsistent (as the above quote shows), having only a political attack as its aim.

25. Ravitch, op. cit., p. 28.

26. Blau, Peter and Otis Dudley Duncan. The American Occupational Structure (New York: Wiley, 1967); quoted in Ravitch, Ibid.

27. Blau and Duncan, op. cit., p. 233., quoted in Ravitch, Ibid.

28. Blau and Duncan, op. cit., p. 233.

29. Perlo, Victor. Economics of Racism, U.S.A.: Roots of Black Inequality (New York: International, 1975), p. 19.

30. Ibid.

31. Anderson, Charles H. The Political Economy of Social Class (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1974), p. 140.

32. Ibid.

33. Ibid.

34. Ibid., p. 141.

35. Blau and Duncan, op. cit., p. 212.

36. Ravitch, op. cit., p. 29.

37. Ibid., p. 32.

38. Ibid.

39. Perlo, op. cit., p. 37.

40. Ibid., pp. 48-49.

41. Ravitch, op. cit., pp. 32-33.

42. In this regard, see the important article by Marvin J. Berlowitz, "Pedagogy of Oppression in the University; Trends Toward the 'Fascisization' of the Academy", The Insurgent Sociologist, vol. VI, no. IV (Summer, 1976).

43. Perlo, op. cit., p. 11.

44. "Black College Enrollment Held Equal to Population Proportion", New York Times, December 4, 1975, p. 33.

45. Ibid.

46. Durkheim, Emile. The Rules of Sociological Method (New York: Free Press, 1966).

47. See, for example, Fred Pincus. "Tracking in Community Colleges", The Insurgent Sociologist, vol. IV, no. III (Spring, 1974). Another good article in this area is Ellen Kay Trimberger. "Open Admissions: A New Form of Tracking?", The Insurgent Sociologist, vol. IV, no. I (Fall, 1973).

48. Institute for the Study of Educational Policy. Equal Educational Opportunity for Blacks in U.S. Higher Education, An Assessment (Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1976), p. 55.

49. Brown, Frank and Madelon D. Stent. "Black College Undergraduates, Enrollment, and Earned Degrees: Parity or Underrepresentation?", Journal of Black Studies, vol. 6, no. 1 (September, 1975). This article is the product of a study supported by a Ford Foundation grant. As pointed out in footnote 18, above, the Brown and Stent study was not afforded the same broad mode of dissemination as was the superficial and erroneous work of Ravitch. The Brown and Stent study finds support in the work of Pincus and Trimberger, referred to in footnote 47, above.

50. Ibid., p. 15.

51. "The Characteristics and Attitudes of 1976-77 Freshmen", The Chronicle of Higher Education, January 10, 1977, pp. 12-13.

52. Brown, Frank and Madelon D. Stent. "Black Graduate and Professional School Enrollment: A Struggle for Equality", Journal of Black Studies, vol. 6, no. 1 (September, 1975), p. 24. This study, which was also supported by a Ford Foundation grant, received little of the coverage experienced by Ravitch's piece.

53. Board on Human-Resources Data and Analyses; Commission on Human Resources, National Research Council. Summary Report; 1975, Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities (Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1976), p. 22.

54. Newt Davidson Collective. Crisis at CUNY (New York: Newt Davidson Collective, 1974). See also Ellen Kay Trimberger's article mentioned in footnote 46, above.

55. Ravitch, op. cit., p. 17.

56. Ibid.

57. Huberman, Leo and Paul M. Sweezy. Socialism in Cuba (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1969), pp. 24-28.

58. Ibid.

59. Gerth, Hans and C. Wright Mills. From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958), p. 240.

A further comment on bureaucracy from Eduard Batalov's excellent work, The Philosophy of Revolt, is instructive. Although Batalov's point is a criticism of anarchist misconceptions about bureaucracy, de-bureaucratization and the administrative apparatus, it is helpful in critically analyzing Ravitch's "convergence theory" model of bureaucracy. For Ravitch, bureaucracy is given an elevated existence, transcending classes and societies with different social systems. However, as Batalov notes:

"The omnipotence of the bureaucracy in developed capitalist society engenders an unusual aberration in the anti-bureaucratic rebel among the theoreticians of the radical Left: the bureaucracy starts to appear to them as an inalienable feature of organisation as such.

Here attention should be paid to the fact that in run-of-the-mill consciousness, as incidentally also in certain theories of anarchist complexion oriented to precisely that type of consciousness, the presence of bureaucracy in society is firmly linked with the existence of a relatively independent and stable administrative apparatus, starting with national institutions and going as far as factory or workshop administration. From this point of view de-bureaucratisation appears as nothing but the straightforward destruction of the administrative apparatus. This stand is the result of unwarranted identification of the state machinery, as the apparatus of power, the apparatus of suppression of one social group by another, with the administrative apparatus as an apparatus organising social life, that is material and cultural production. This identification is not difficult to understand if we remember that in modern capitalist society the administrative apparatus is placed entirely at the service of the state apparatus. (Batalov, Eduard. The Philosophy of Revolt: Criticism of Left Radical Ideology. Moscow: Progress, 1975, pp. 226-227).

60. Ravitch, op. cit., p. 13.

61. Ibid., p. 59.

62. Schwendinger, Herman and Julia Schwendinger. The Sociologists of the Chair (New York: Basic, 1974), p. 523.

63. Spring, Joel H. A Primer of Libertarian Education (New York: Free Life Editions, 1975).

64. _____. Education and the Rise of the Corporate State (Boston: Beacon, 1972).

65. _____. The Sorting Machine: National Educational Policy Since 1945 (New York: McKay, 1976).

66. Russell, Bill. "Labor's Contributions to the Establishment of Public Schooling in the United States (19th century)": paper delivered at the American Educational Research Association Meetings, New York, April, 1977.

67. "...political repression of radical scholarship within the academy has been one of the most important factors determining the nature of American sociology [or other social sciences for that matter] throughout its entire history. By examining the operative interpretations of academic freedom that have actually prevailed in the American academy, it will be concluded that it would have been virtually impossible for the field to have been dominated by...modern theoretical variations in liberal functionalism-if it were not for the political repression of radical scholarship. As far as sociology [and other social sciences] in the United States is concerned, the long-term consequences of the systematic political repression of radical alternatives within the American academy cannot be overstated (Schwendinger and Schwendinger, op. cit., pp. 490-491)."

References

Alperovitz, Gar. Atomic Diplomacy: Hiroshima and Potsdam (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1965).

Anderson, Charles H. The Political Economy of Social Class (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1974).

Batalov, Eduard. The Philosophy of Revolt: Criticism of Left Radical Ideology (Moscow: Progress, 1975).

Berlowitz, Marvin J. "Pedagogy of Oppression in the University; Trends Toward the 'Fascisization' of the Academy," The Insurgent Sociologist, Vol. VI, No. IV (Summer, 1976).

"Black College Enrollment Held Equal to Population Proporation", New York Times (December 4, 1975).

Blau, Peter and Otis Dudley Duncan. The American Occupational Structure (New York: Wiley, 1967).

Board on Human-Resource Data and Analyses; Commission on Human Resources, National Research Council. Summary Report: 1975, Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities (Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1976).

Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis. Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life (New York: Basic, 1976).

Brown, Frank and Madelon D. Stent. "Black College Undergraduates, Enrollment, and Earned Degrees: Parity or Underrepresentation?", Journal of Black Studies, Vol. 6, No. 1 (September, 1975).

_____. "Black Graduate and Professional School Enrollment: A Struggle for Equality", Journal of Black Studies, Vol. 6, No. 1 (September, 1975).

"The Characteristics and Attitudes of 1976-77 Freshmen", The Chronicle of Higher Education (January 10, 1977).

The Chronicle of Higher Education (April 11, 1977).

Crozier, Michel J., Samuel P. Huntington and Joji Watanuki. The Crisis of Democracy: Report on the Governability of Democracies to the Trilateral Commission (New York: New York University Press, 1975).

Durkheim, Emile. The Rules of Sociological Method (New York: Free Press, 1966).

Feinberg, Walter and Henry Rosemont, Jr., eds., Work, Technology and Education: Dissenting Essays in the Intellectual Foundations of American Education (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1975).

Feinberg, Walter. Reason and Rhetoric: The Intellectual Foundations of Twentieth Century Liberal Educational Policy (New York: Wiley, 1975).

Ford Foundation. Report, October 1, 1971-September 30, 1972 (New York: Ford Foundation, 1972).

Foundation News, Vol. 15, No. 4 (August, 1974).

_____, Vol. 15, No. 6 (December, 1974).

Gerth, Hans and C. Wright Mills. From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958).

Greer, Colin. The Great School Legend: A Revisionist Interpretation of American Public Education (New York: Basic, 1972).

Hellman, Lillian. Scoundrel Time (Boston: Little Brown, 1976).

Hofstadter, Richard. The Age of Reform (New York: Vintage, 1955).

Huberman, Leo and Paul M. Sweezy. Socialism in Cuba (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1969).

Institute for the Study of Educational Policy. Equal Educational Opportunity for Blacks in U.S. Higher Education, An Assessment (Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1976).

Karier, Clarence J., Paul Violas and Joel Spring. Roots of Crisis: American Education in the Twentieth Century (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973).

Karier, Clarence J., ed. Shaping the American Educational State: 1900 to the Present (New York: Free Press, 1975).

_____. "Making the World Safe for Democracy: An Historical Critique of John Dewey's Pragmatic Liberal Philosophy in the Warfare State", Educational Theory, Vol. 27, No. 1 (Winter, 1977).

Katz, Michael. Class, Bureaucracy and Schools (New York: Praeger, 1971).

_____. The Irony of Early School Reform: Educational Innovation in Mid-nineteenth Century Massachusetts (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968).

Kolko, Gabriel. The Triumph of Conservatism: A Reinterpretation of American History, 1900-1916 (New York: Quadrangle, 1967).

Kuznets, Simon. "Demographic Aspects of the Distribution of Income Among Families: Recent Trends in the United States", Econometrics and Economic Theory: Essays in Honor of Jan Tinbergen (White Plains, N.Y.: International Arts and Sciences Press, 1974).

Lenin, V. I. Collected Works, Vol. 7 (Moscow: Progress, 1973).

Lowenheim, Francis. Book Review of Robert James Maddox's, The New Left and the Origins of the Cold War in, The New York Times Book Review (June 17, 1973).

Maddox, Robert James. The New Left and the Origins of the Cold War (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973).

Marx, Karl. The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon (New York: International, 1969).

Mason, Daniel. "On 'Scoundrels' and 'Toads'", Political Affairs, Vol. LV, No. 12 (December, 1976).

National Academy of Education. Committee on Educational Policy. Policy Making for American Public Schools; Recommendations Based Upon Working Papers (Syracuse: National Academy of Education, 1969).

National School Public Relations Association. Compensatory Education: What Works to Help Disadvantaged Pupils (Arlington, Virginia: National School Public Relations Association, 1973).

The New York Times Book Review (June 17, 1973).

The New York Times (June 29, 1973).

Newt Davidson Collective. Crisis at CUNY (New York: Newt Davidson Collective, 1974).

Okun, Arthur M. Equality and Efficiency: The Big Tradeoff (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1975).

Paglin, Morton. "The Measurement and Trend of Inequality: A Basic Revision", The American Economic Review, Vol. 65, No. 4 (September, 1975).

Perlo, Victor. Economics of Racism, U.S.A.: Roots of Black Inequality (New York: International, 1975).

Pincus. Fred. "Tracking in Community Colleges", The Insurgent Sociologist, Vol. IV, No. III (Spring, 1974).

Ravitch, Diane. "The Revisionists Revised: Studies in the Historiography of American Education" (No place of publication: National Academy of Education, 1977).

Russell, Bill. "Labor's Contributions to the Establishment of Public Schooling in the United States (19th century)", paper delivered at the American Educational Research Association Meetings, New York City (April, 1977).

Schwendinger, Herman and Julia Schwendinger. The Sociologists of the Chair (New York: Basic, 1974).

Sobell, Morton. On Doing Time (New York: Bantam, 1976).

Spring, Joel. Education and the Rise of the Corporate State (Boston: Beacon, 1972).

_____. A Primer of Libertarian Education (New York: Free Life Editions, 1975).

_____. The Sorting Machine: National Educational Policy Since 1945 (New York: David McKay, 1976).

Trimberger, Ellen Kay. "Open Admissions: A New Form of Tracking?", The Insurgent Sociologist, Vol. IV, No. I (Fall, 1973).

United States Bureau of the Census. Statistical Abstract of the United States (96th edition), (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975).

United States Government. 26 U.S.C. Sec. 501 (c) (3) (1970).

Weinstein, James. The Corporate Ideal in the Liberal State: 1900-1918 (Boston; Beacon, 1968).

Williams, William Appleman. The Contours of American History (Chicago: Quadrangle, 1969).